

than dismissal, which entails an analysis of alternative sanctions; and (6) the meritoriousness of the claim or defense.

Id. at 868. Upon due consideration of Appellee's discussion of the *Poulis* factors, the Court concurs with the same and concludes that dismissal is warranted. Moreover, as regard factor 3, history of dilatoriness, the Court finds that Appellant's failure to respond to the instant motion further reinforces that said factor favors dismissal. Accordingly, the Court hereby finds that this matter should be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 8018(a)(4).

Upon consideration of the foregoing, Appellee's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Prosecution (ECF No. 9) is granted. Appellant's Bankruptcy Appeal is hereby dismissed. The Clerk will mark this case closed.

Dated: November 8, 2023

BY THE COURT:


MARILYN J. HORAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE